

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The final Office Action mailed October 27, 2009 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 5, 8, 10 and 13 are hereby amended. Claims 1-4, 7, 9, 12 and 15-17 were previously canceled. No claims are added. Accordingly, claims 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13 and 14 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended to Applicant's Representative during the personal interview conducted on February 2, 2010. The substance of the interview is reflected in the amendments to the claims made above and in the Remarks that follow. As indicated in the Interview Summary mailed on February 5, 2010, agreement was reached that the amendments to the claims would define over the art of record. The Examiner must update his search in light of the claim amendments and prior to rendering a final decision concerning allowability.

Claims 5, 10, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japan 11-207078 (hereinafter “JP ‘078”) in view of either U.S. Patent No. 3,194,398 to Fecho (hereinafter “Fecho”) or U.S. Patent No. 4,411,664 to Rickard et al. (hereinafter “Rickard”). *Office Action* at p. 2, ¶ 2. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and requests reconsideration.

Independent claim 5 is allowable over JP ‘078 in view of either Fecho or Rickard in that claim 5 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “selectively performing a preliminary spin drying operation only when the measured laundry quantity is the same as or bigger than a reference quantity value; performing a main spin drying operation.” JP ‘078 does not teach or suggest at least these features of the claims.

The Office purports that JP ‘078 discloses “performing a preliminary spin drying operation (see “intermediate dehydration”) when the measured laundry quantity is not smaller than a reference value; and performing a main spin drying operation (see “high-speed

dehydration).” *Office Action* at p. 2. *JP ‘078*, however, discloses rotation of the dehydration tank where “when [the] load is large, the tank is turned gently” and “when the load is less, [the] tank is rotated quickly.” In other words, the intermediate dehydration, referred to by the Office, occurs in either instance. In contrast, Applicant claims “selectively performing a preliminary spin drying operation only when the measured laundry quantity is the same as or bigger than a reference quantity value; performing a main spin drying operation.”

Fecho fails to cure the deficiencies of *JP ‘078*. Indeed, the Office only relied on *Fecho* to purportedly disclose “that certain operations may be employed in either a vertical or drum type washing machine.” *Office Action* at p. 3.

Rickard fails to cure the deficiencies of *JP ‘078*. Indeed, the Office only relied on *Richard* to purportedly disclose “termination of the spin drying process after the main spin operation.” *Office Action* at p. 2. Accordingly, none of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests “selectively performing a preliminary spin drying operation only when the measured laundry quantity is the same as or bigger than a reference quantity value; performing a main spin drying operation,” as recited in independent claim 5

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of independent claim 5. Claims 10, 13 and 14 depend from independent claim 5. It stands to reason that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of those dependent claims should be withdrawn as well.

Claims 6, 8 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *JP ‘078* in view of *Fecho* or *Rickard* further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,029,299 to Baek et al. (hereinafter “*Baek*”), U.S. Patent No. 6,539,753 to Ito et al. (hereinafter “*Ito*”) or U.S. Patent No. 6,163,912 to Matsuura et al. (hereinafter “*Matsuura*”). *Office Action* at p. 3, ¶ 3. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and requests reconsideration.

Baek, *Ito* and *Matsuura* fail to cure the deficiencies of *JP ‘078*, *Fecho* and *Rickard* with respect to independent claim 5. Indeed, the Office only relied upon *Baek*, *Ito* and *Matsuura* to purportedly disclose “the laundry quantity as claimed.” *Office Action* at p. 4. Because none of the cited references, either individually or in combination, teaches or suggests each and every

element of independent claim 5, they also fail to teach or suggest each and every element of claims 6, 8 and 11, which depend from claim 5. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Office to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 6, 8 and 11.

CONCLUSION

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: April 16, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Michael I. Angert/
Michael I. Angert
Registration No.: 46,522
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant